UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
35th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 13 November 1990
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on all disarmament agenda items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.35
14 November 1990
ENGLISH

90-63214 2824V (E)

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I apologize to representatives for the delay in starting the meeting, which was caused by the fact that several delegations wanted a little more time to continue and finalize consultations.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, namely, A/C.1/45/L.1, L.18 and L.28. We shall then take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, in cluster 8. After completing action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will move on to take action on one of the draft resolutions in cluster 9, namely, A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1.

(The Chairman)

In the light of ongoing consultations, and on the basis of special requests received from several delegations, consideration of and action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 in cluster 6 and draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B and A/C.1/45/L.45 in cluster 7 have been deferred to a later stage. Similarly, consideration of and action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 in cluster 9 have also been postponed to a later stage.

Before we proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/45/L.17, Chile; A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, Costa Rica; A/C.1/45/L.31, Togo and Cape Verde; A/C.1/45/L.51, Ecuador, New Zealand, Suriname, the Central African Republic, Barbados, Togo and Nigeria; and A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, Samoa.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): A priority question in the area of disarmament, the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, has for more than 30 years now had a prominent place on the annual agendas of the General Assembly. The 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water is an important landmark in the history of this item. Its negotiation, in the midst of the cold war was the result of tenacious efforts by the leaders of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union owing in large part to the pressure of world public opinion, for the world was alarmed by the dangers to everyone's health posed by nuclear-test

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

explosions, especially those in the atmosphere which produced ominous clouds. However, the main nuclear Powers had already found a way to carry out those tests underground, and since 1963 there have been about 1,200 of these tests, primarily with the objective of qualitatively improving nuclear arsenals.

Nuclear tests carried out underground were lost sight of, and public opinion almost forgot about them in spite of the many ongoing multilateral efforts to ban them. Indeed, year after year the General Assembly has taken a stand on this question and for nearly three decades the Conference on Disarmament has been considering it. But the five nuclear-weapon countries have continued testing, while the impatience of the other countries has been growing; hence, the initiative of Indonesia, Peru, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico and the request by more than one-third of the States Parties to the partial test-ban Treaty to convene a conference to consider an amendment that would convert the Treaty into a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. On the basis of resolution 44/106 of 15 December 1989, the Meeting Organization of the Amendment Conference was held this year and the Conference itself will be held in New York from 7 to 18 January 1991.

In connection with this item, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.31, sponsored by the following 49 countries: Afghanistan, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mexico.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

The draft resolution is fundamentally procedural. In its preamble reference is made to resolution 44/106 and the conviction is reiterated

"that a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is the highest-priority measure for the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and for the achievement of the objective of nuclear disarmament".

Reference is also made to resolution 1910 (XVIII) of 27 November 1963, in which the General Assembly noted with approval the partial test-ban Treaty and requested the Conference on Disarmament "to continue with a sense of urgency its negotiations" to achieve a complete ban on nuclear tests. Similarly, it is recalled that the convening of the Amendment Conference was requested by more than one third of the parties to the Treaty. The conviction is reiterated

"that such a conference will facilitate the attainment of the objectives set forth in the Treaty and thus serve to strengthen it".

The draft resolution takes note with satisfaction of the holding from 29 May to 8 June 1990 of the Meeting for the Organization of the Amendment Conference and, in operative paragraph 1, notes that the Amendment Conference will be held in New York from 7 to 18 January 1991.

Operative paragraph 2 calls upon all parties to the Treaty to participate in, and to contribute to the success of, the Amendment Conference. In the next paragraph, the General Assembly reiterates its conviction that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, the nuclear-weapon States should suspend all nuclear-test explosions through an agreed moratorium or unilateral moratoria.

The sponsors are convinced that the success of the Amendment Conference should be measured in the light of its contribution to the achievement of a

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

complete nuclear-test ban. Hence, operative paragraph 4 recommends

"that arrangements be made to ensure that intensive efforts continue, under the auspices of the Amendment Conference, until a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is achieved".

At the same time, it is recommended that the Amendment Conference

"establish a working group, or other means it deems appropriate, to study, inter alia, the organization of control, institutional mechanisms and legal aspects of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and to report its conclusions to the Conference".

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

In view of the efforts that have been made in other forums on this subject the draft resolution emphasizes the importance of bringing about proper co-ordination between those forums. The Conference is thus part of a multilateral effort that is of concern and is imperative to all of us. There is no doubt that the holding of the Conference will serve to promote a debate on this priority disarmament question and to facilitate a solution. We are sure that the States parties to the 1963 Treaty are prepared fully to carry out the commitments set forth in the preamble.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/45/56/Rev.1 and A/C.1/45/L.51.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): It gives me great pleasure to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", contained in document A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1. This draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, New Zealand, Samoa, Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

In previous years the General Assembly adopted two separate resolutions on the issue of negative security assurances, submitted by Bulgaria and Pakistan, respectively. This year also, two separate draft resolutions, contained in documents A/C.1/45/L.9 and A/C.1/45/L.19, were submitted by Bulgaria and Pakistan, respectively. However, taking into consideration the views expressed by a number of delegations at the last session of the General Assembly, as well as in the general debate in the First Committee this year, sincere efforts were undertaken by Pakistan and Bulgaria, along with other interested delegations, to come up with a single draft resolution.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

It gives me great pleasure to inform the Committee that, after a great deal of concerted and time-consuming efforts, a single text has been agreed upon, and it is now before the Committee in document A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1. The merger of draft resolutions L.9 and L.19 reflects the spirit of mutual understanding and accommodation and is in keeping with the efforts of this Committee to rationalize its work. Obviously, L.56/Rev.1 replaces the earlier draft resolutions, L.9 and L.19, both of which are withdrawn.

Following agreement on the text of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56, some further changes were proposed to improve the new draft resolution even further. In a spirit of accommodation and flexibility some of them were agreed upon. Those modifications are now reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1.

May I now point out these changes: first, the sixth preambular paragraph has been dropped, as it duplicated the earlier third preambular paragraph; secondly, a minor drafting change has been made in the ninth preambular paragraph, where the following words in the second and third lines - namely, "constitute an important positive contribution" - have been replaced by the expression "contribute positively"; thirdly, a new fifth preambular paragraph has been added, which reads as follows: "Welcoming the progress achieved in recent years in both nuclear and conventional disarmament". These three changes are all reflected in document A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1.

We have consistently expressed deep concern over the threat posed to non-nuclear-weapon States by the nuclear arsenals of nuclear-weapon States. The most effective assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would be their complete elimination. However, until this objective is achieved the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with credible and legally binding guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Such assurances are necessary to enhance the sense of security in non-nuclear-weapon States. The

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

slow pace of negotiations on nuclear disarmament makes such assurances even more imperative.

The merged text of the draft resolution on this issue reaffirms the urgent need for reaching an agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It appeals to all States to demonstrate the necessary political will to reach an agreement on a common approach and to move towards the adoption of an international instrument of a legally binding character on this issue of vital importance to the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank all those delegations that have played an important and constructive role in helping the delegations of Bulgaria and Pakistan in our common effort to evolve a merged text on the subject.

May I, finally, express the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, which I have just introduced and which replaces L.9 and L.19, will enjoy the support of the entire membership of this Committee.

I have the honour now to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Regional disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/45/L.51, on behalf of Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Djibouti, Egypt, Germany, Guinea, Italy, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Zimbabwe and Pakistan.

May I point out a minor typographical error in operative paragraph 3 in the English version of this document, where a comma should be added in the first line after the words "wherever possible".

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

Since its inception the United Nations has provided a focal point for the international community in its efforts to promote the maintenance of international peace and security through disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and general co-operation. From the very beginning, disarmament emerged as a major element in the move towards global security. As the world prepares to enter the next millennium, disarmament stands at the heart of any long-term solution to the problem of international peace and security.

The essential guidelines for progress towards general and complete disarmament were adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Unfortunately, these goals and objectives are still far from being achieved.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

We are however encouraged by the improvement in the international political climate and by the prospects of genuine progress towards general and complete disarmament engendered in recent years as a result of the virtual end of ideological confrontation, and the new spirit of mutual co-operation and understanding between the long-term adversaries.

In the post-cold-war era, regional disarmament has assumed increasing importance in the context of global peace and security. We all agree that a global response to disarmament must continue to be pursued sincerely. Simultaneously with global efforts, it is imperative that collective endeavours are made by all countries at the regional level to promote disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and confidence-building measures wherever and whenever possible. These measures must of course take into account the specific characteristics of each region, and must be taken with the free agreement of the States concerned.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 treats these elements together in a comprehensive manner, without singling out any one of them. It therefore transcends any particular point in time or any particular region. It complements the existing global efforts and existing arrangements, and in no way undermines any of them.

Regional disarmament is thus an indispensable corollary to the global efforts towards the achievement of the objective of general and complete disarmament. The global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other and should be pursued simultaneously with a view to promoting regional and international peace and security. The objective of peace and security is so important and compelling that all efforts, both global and regional, have to be deployed with a view to achieving that end.

This is the essence of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51. The draft resolution, which is the result of the collective endeavours of a number of countries

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

representing various regions of the world, is transparent, realistic and forward-looking. It has equal relevance and applicability now and in the future, and for all regions.

It is the expectation of the sponsors that this draft resolution will receive the widest support of this Committee.

Mr. STANKOV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation has asked to speak in order to announce that it has withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.9 entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

We take this opportunity, Sir, to express the belief that the merged texts on this item as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 is well-balanced and leaves open all possible avenues for making headway on the issue of negative security assurances. Accordingly, we hope that it will receive the support of all delegations.

We wish also to express our gratitude to all delegations with which we have fruitfully co-operated in materializing the overwhelming will expressed in the Committee, namely to rationalize common efforts on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the following draft resolutions in cluster 7: A/C.1/45/L.1, A/C.1/45/L.18 and A/C.1/45/L.28.

I now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on the draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation wishes to comment on item 49 of the agenda, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", and item 61, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

At the outset I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs and three independent consultant experts for preparing a comprehensive study on effective and verifiable measures which would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, contained in document A/45/435.

My country was pleased to play host on two occasions to the experts and other officials of the Department for Disarmament Affairs who were conducting the study. In the course of their visits, fruitful discussions were held between the officials and experts of our country and the members of the mission. We are of the view that this comprehensive study could serve as a sound basis for promoting future action towards the realization of such a zone. Therefore, it deserves to be examined and carefully considered by all parties concerned. At the same time, one cannot lose sight of the fact that a selective approach towards the content of this study could be destructive and could backfire.

The overall political and military situation in the Middle East in recent years can hardly be compared with that of 1974, when my country initiated the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone owing to the rapid dissemination of nuclear technology in the region.

(Mr. Moradi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Politically, not only has no progress been made in the settlement of long-standing problems of the region, including the question of the occupation of Palestine by the Zionist régime, the occupation of southern Lebanon and foreign interference in the internal affairs of the region, but also there has been a further deterioration in the situation.

Militarily, on the one hand the most advanced and sophisticated weapons have been put at the disposal of the Zionist régime by certain big Powers; on the other hand, the flow of arms to the arsenals of the countries in the region has increased the current state of insecurity and instability in the region.

It is ironic that the said Powers are calling for the promotion of peace and security in the Middle East. In short, the problems of this region are becoming more complicated and thus more dangerous.

(Mr. Moradi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

The situation in the Middle East rouses serious doubts with regard to ongoing positive developments in international affairs and as to whether the international community will enter a new era of co-operation and détente. This unfortunate reality is partly due to the fact that such developments have not yet been institutionalized in various areas of international relations. It emanates also from the absence of a collective security arrangement among the Muslim countries in the Middle East. Such a security system, enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, could, as a rule of conduct, harmonize the relations among these States on the basis of common aspirations and mutual interests and could prevent potential threats and conflicts in the region. In this regard, the ideal of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would contribute enormously to filling the gap caused by the absence of a collective security system.

The realization of such a zone demands confidence-building measures, which have always been considered as facilitating and complementary to disarmament initiatives. The Islamic Republic of Iran, committed to such measures, has adopted confidence-building measures, some of which are mentioned in document A/45/397, since the very inception of the Islamic revolution. Although the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has been prevented, owing to circumstances beyond its control, from continuing and strengthening such measures, in 1986 it proposed to the Persian Gulf States the establishment of collective security arrangements in the region. In that regard the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country submitted a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, contained in document S/18387 of 16 October 1986.

The realization of international peace and security is not feasible without a secure and stable Middle East. There is no doubt that the Security Council in discharging its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations can play a

(Mr. Moradi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

significant role in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The Muslim countries of the region that would lose their security because of the establishment of such a zone deserve the right to be guaranteed unconditionally by nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Another issue closely related to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East concerns the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. This Declaration - almost two decades have elapsed since its adoption by the General Assembly - demonstrates the will and desire of Governments and nations of the region to create a safe and secure environment conducive to mutual co-operation and collaboration. Regrettably, some of the ultra-regional States that consider the creation of such a zone inconsistent with their own interests have resorted to numerous means to prevent the convening of the Colombo Conference for the implementation of that Declaration. My delegation believes that, had the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace been implemented earlier, many of the regional conflicts would have been prevented.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): On behalf of the European Community and its member States, the Italian delegation wishes to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28, on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/104 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

The Twelve believe that the Treaty of Tlatelolco continues to represent a particularly important element in the process of preventing a proliferation of nuclear weapons and of promoting peace and security. In this context, the Twelve believe it is inappropriate to continue the practice of singling out one country while omitting mention of others which have not become full parties to the Treaty.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

The Twelve have expressed support for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. We consider that the creation of such zones could contribute to stability in the areas concerned, to non-proliferation and to the disarmament process in general, provided that the States concerned are prepared to participate on the basis of agreements freely entered into and in keeping with internationally recognized principles.

In that context, it is our view that the General Assembly may in the future wish to consider enlarging the scope of the pertinent agenda item to read "Implementation of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco) in all its aspects".

The CHAIRMAN: I call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes before a vote is taken on draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. CHADHA (India): The Indian delegation wishes to place on record our views with regard to the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", document A/C.1/45/L.18, introduced by Pakistan.

The position of India on this issue is based on certain principles that form part of our disarmament policy. These are also contained in the consensus Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978. We have consistently maintained that nuclear disarmament is a global and not a regional issue. Lasting world peace can only be built on the basis of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Within this process nuclear disarmament is accorded the highest priority, and this was accepted by the world community in the 1978 Final Document. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones does not, in our view, accord with the global approach. In the action plan for ushering in a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world order presented in 1988 at the third

(Mr. Chadha, India)

special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament we highlighted the importance of a global approach. Nuclear zoning measures of the kind visualized in resolutions such as that contained in document A/C.1/45/L.18 will not lead us to our common objective of a global nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The global spread of nuclear weapons and their deployment for possible use anywhere in the world renders illusory the notion of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In addition, studies on the climatic and environmental consequences of a nuclear exchange, including the findings with regard to nuclear winter, have shown that there cannot be a distinction between combatant and non-combatant when nuclear weapons are involved.

(Mr. Chadha, India)

In spite of these reservations, we recognize the fact that nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established in other parts of the world as a result of arrangements freely arrived at among the countries of the region. We have therefore participated in the global consensus in favour of these nuclear-weapon-free zones. These arrangements arise out of the shared perception of the States of the region regarding the special features and geographical extent of the region, and as a result of prior consultations carried out to reach a consensus. Only after a consensus is reached can the United Nations play a significant role in endorsing such an agreement.

The proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 does not carry these qualifications. Since the proposal is clearly not introduced in this forum with a view to achieving a regional consensus, it can only be concluded that the intent behind the draft resolution is not serious.

Draft resolutions such as this, introduced as a ritual and lacking in substantive content and necessary qualifications, run counter to the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In 1974 we, too, introduced a draft resolution on this subject. It was adopted by an overwhelming majority, but did not enjoy a consensus among the States of the region. We have therefore directed our efforts to consensus building and have not engaged in the ritual submission of draft resolutions. A climate of trust and confidence must be created and consensus must be achieved on overcoming the practical difficulties of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone among the States of the region. This requires patience, perseverance and sincerity, not rhetoric or ritual draft resolutions.

For these reasons, my delegation will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18.

Mr. FERNANDEZ (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that I have spoken in the First Committee, I wish to associate myself with other speakers who have congratulated you and the other officers on the successful manner in which you have been guiding our deliberations.

Bolivia's legal ties with the prohibition of nuclear weapons is nothing new and is not merely theoretical. It is a confirmation of a humanist conviction that involves repudiation of any form of violence, in particular the dissemination and use of nuclear energy as an instrument of destruction and genocide.

For this reason, my country, together with the rest of the 21 States of Latin America, signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco, joining the general trend in favour of prevention of the manufacture, posession and use of nuclear weapons in the southern hemisphere. It was an expression of our determined support for anything that would prevent war and its most evil expression - the use of atomic energy as a means of extermination.

In the years that have elapsed since the Treaty of Tlatelolco was signed, Bolivia has noted with great pleasure that the major nuclear Powers have become parties to the Treaty. However, we are profoundly concerned by the fact that the signing of the Treaty and its Additional Protocol I has in some cases not been followed by the necessary ratification.

As many delegations said in the course of the general debate, the international community's main objective is, if possible, to prohibit completely the manufacture, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons. Therefore we commend the United Nations for the work it is doing in support of maximum guarantees for States which neither possess nor wish to possess nuclear weapons but are doomed to suffer the consequences of tests that take place in distant areas; tests which, although

(Mr. Fernandez, Bolivia)

they appear not to carry any risk, could result in atmospheric or climatic changes, such as prolonged flooding or droughts, with grave risks for the civil population.

Unfortunately, the developing countries, which lack sufficient resources to meet even their own most urgent needs, are the most exposed and defenceless in the face of the negative effects of radiation and the consequent environmental pollution.

The delegation of Bolivia views with great interest, and supports, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.1, L.18 and, in particular, L.28, on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/104 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which at least aims at the establishment regionally of nuclear-weapon-free zones and has as its objective the eradication of the nuclear weapon as a means of warfare.

Mr. NGUYEN DUC HUNG (Viet Nam): My delegation has asked to speak in order to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

As has been stated on many occasions by its leaders, Viet Nam supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all parts of the world because it views this as a positive and practical contribution to the attainment of the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament and thus the promotion of peace and stability in the various regions and throughout the world.

In this spirit, my delegation supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. At the same time, we deem it important to emphasize that, since the question is of concern to all countries in the region, the draft resolution should reflect the views of the countries concerned and their consensus opinion.

(Mr. Nguyen Duc Hung, Viet Nam)

Regrettably, draft resolution L.18 fails to achieve this. My delegation will therefore abstain on the draft resolution, and expresses the hope that the countries in the region will join together and introduce a consensus draft resolution in the near future.

Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan): The Republic of Afghanistan supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in every corner of the globe. We consider this positive process to be an integral part of general nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

However, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", my delegation will abstain, as it has done on similar draft resolutions in the past. Our reason for taking such a position was explained in my statement in the Committee on 26 October.

In addition, I should like to make the following comments.

First, the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia should be the subject, first, of consultations with the countries of the region, in order to reflect the collective view and position of the States directly concerned. We hope that the sponsors will keep that in mind in the future.

Secondly, the draft resolution should not be politically motivated and should address the question taking into consideration all the problems in this respect. We believe that such an approach is necessary if we really want to work constructively towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Thirdly, the sincerity of the main sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 should be examined in the light of its refusal to accede to a universal agreement on nuclear disarmament, by which I mean the non-proliferation Treaty, and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. We therefore hope that the main sponsor will accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and accept the IAEA safeguards. Furthermore, it must give up its attempts to produce nuclear weapons.

Lastly, we are of the opinion that any linkage with accession to the non-proliferation Treaty is irrelevant.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions in cluster 7, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

(The Chairman)

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1 is Egypt.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia." This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 are the following: Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Iceland, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Mongolia, Myanmar, Norway, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18 was adopted by 98 votes to 3, with 26 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/104 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28 reads as follows: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Angola, Argentina, Cuba, France

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28 was adopted by 126 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. GEVERS (Netherlands): I should like to explain the position of the Netherlands on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

As in previous years, my delegation went along with the consensus on the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Indeed, the Netherlands fully supports the ambition of the States in the region to achieve such a zone.

My delegation listened with great interest and sympathy to the statement pertaining to this matter made by the representative of Egypt in this Committee on 9 November. At the same time, my delegation wishes to underline the fact that the objective of a multilateral agreement on a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be freely negotiated by all States directly concerned.

We believe that this element should have been brought more clearly into focus in draft resolution L.1. This does not mean, however, that it is not possible in the meantime, to make efforts to ease the process leading to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In fact, the report of the Secretary-General, including the commendable study on effective and verifiable measures that would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, shows that States both in and outside the region could take a number of steps that would have a beneficial, confidence-building effect on the present tensions in the region.

As is recognized in the report, the application of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards to all relevant installations in the region is one of the measures that would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and

(Mr. Gevers, Netherlands)

could make a significant contribution to preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr. GROOP (Finland): I wish to explain Finland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

We voted in favour of the draft resolution because it is the general policy of Finland to support efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones. At the same time, we consider that initiatives for the establishment of such zones should come from States within the region and that the process of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone should enjoy the support of all States concerned.

Mr. POERNOMO (Indonesia): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

The position of my delegation on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. It is based on the principle contained in the Final Document of the General Assembly's first special session on disarmament, which, among other things, stipulates that the establishment of such a zone should be based on arrangements freely arrived at between the States in the region concerned. As is reflected in the Secretary-General's report (A/45/462) on the subject, this requirement has not so far been fulfilled in respect of South Asia. In view of this fact my delegation was constrained to abstain in the vote on draft resolution L.18.

Mr. GIEROW (Sweden): Sweden has on several occasions expressed its positive attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones could have confidence-building effects, as well as a positive influence on the political climate and the security situation in the regions concerned.

(Mr. Gierow, Sweden)

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone requires that nuclear weapons are not possessed by States in the zone, as well as the absence and non-deployment of nuclear weapons in such States. Another essential element is the commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

As to concrete proposals for such zones, however, one basic prerequisite must be acceptance of, and co-operation with regard to, the zonal initiative by all States in the region. In line with this principle, Sweden had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, since some States concerned voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian SSR) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the draft resolution just adopted, the delegation of the Ukraine wishes to state that the Ukraine has been consistent in its support for the creation of a non-nuclear world. In the declaration of the sovereignty of the Ukraine, which was adopted by the Parliament on 16 July this year, it is stated that the goal of the Ukraine is compliance with non-nuclear principles. Therefore, we support all peoples who wish to free themselves from the nuclear threat, as well as the idea that this objective should be achieved through, inter alia, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world, with the participation and agreement of all the States in those regions. We therefore supported the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.1 and voted for L.28.

However, in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", my delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote, although we agree with the objectives of the draft resolution. We abstained, first, because there is not full agreement between the States of the region on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Secondly, as we see it,

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

the initiators of the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone there have not yet exhausted all opportunities to reach agreement and adopt a common stand on the issue.

We are sure that, if the States of the region are interested in implementing the positive ideas contained in draft resolution L.18 and if they take the steps necessary to ensure consideration at a future session of the General Assembly of a draft resolution agreed upon by all the countries of the region of South Asia, such a draft resolution will receive support in the General Assembly. Certainly the delegation of the Ukraine will support it.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's vote on the three draft resolutions the Committee has just adopted. Japan participated in the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1, and voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.18 and L.28.

It has always been the view of the Japanese Government that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, in southern Africa, in Latin America or in any other region for that matter, would contribute to the objective of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as to the peace and security of the region in question.

My delegation, however, wishes to reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone would not contribute to the strengthening of the security of the region in question unless certain conditions were met. Let me enumerate some of the most basic of those conditions: the establishment of such a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be agreed upon at the initiative of the countries in the region, and with the voluntary consent of all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States, as the case may be; also, a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be established in such a way that it would not only strengthen the peace and security of the region, but also of the world as a whole. Furthermore, adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty by all the countries of the region in question would be highly desirable in creating such a zone.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I have two explanations of vote to make. The first concerns draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18.

The United States delegation this year again joined in supporting the traditional resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. I have two brief points in explanation of this vote. First, we trust that all States in the region will take particular note of paragraph 2, which urges them to refrain from any action contrary to the objective of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Secondly, our delegation also wishes to note that the reference in the third preambular paragraph to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world does not constitute endorsement by the United States of such zones on a universal basis. For us there are specific criteria which any proposed nuclear-weapon-free zone must meet in order to be recommended.

The second explanation concerns draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.28. Our delegation's vote on this draft resolution was in favour only because of the United States unwavering support for the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The draft resolution itself is seriously unbalanced, and it contains glaring shortcomings. We deeply regret that this draft resolution focuses only on Additional Protocol I and not on the issue of universal adherence by all eligible States. The draft resolution is consequently patently one-sided. It singles out one State for criticism rather than calling, as it should, on other eligible States in the region to become parties. Only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco together with its Protocols enters into force for all eligible States can it make its full contribution to regional and international security.

In sum, it is our considered view that this pioneering Treaty deserves a better resolution than this one.

Mr. JANDL (Austria) (interpretation from French): Austria abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.18, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation would like to emphasize that in general it supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, since such zones can make a valuable contribution to the maintenance of international peace and the reduction of international tensions, above all in the light of interaction between disarmament efforts at the regional and the global levels.

However, my delegation believes that all the States of a particular region or subregion should first adhere to the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

zone in that region or subregion. Austria therefore believes that it is timely to propose the establishment of such a zone within the framework of a General Assembly resolution only when all the States of the region have given their agreement. The States of the region in question here have expressed reservations concerning the draft resolution, and Austria therefore decided to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, which is listed in cluster 8. As there have been no requests to make statements on this cluster, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. CHADHA (India): India fully supports proposals put forward in the First Committee for regional conventional disarmament and on confidence-building measures. Indeed we have joined in sponsoring draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.36 and L.44 on these subjects.

Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 does not fall into the same category. This draft resolution combines unrelated approaches within the ambit of regional disarmament and thereby distorts the focus and undermines the simple objectives of the other resolutions on the subject. It introduces flawed perceptions about regional and even subregional non-proliferation. Such a text discards a consensus approach in favour of polemics. India will therefore abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. GROOP (Finland): I wish to explain the position of the delegation of Finland on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, entitled "Regional disarmament".

In Finland's view, global and regional disarmament efforts complement each other. The increasing attention devoted to the regional approach is welcome within the overall context of disarmament and international security.

(Mr. Groop, Finland)

The nuclear non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) has the widest adherence of all existing multilateral disarmament agreements. In Finland's view there is no better Treaty in signt. Finland considers that universal adherence to the NPT continues to be the best way to secure nuclear non-proliferation in all regions of the world.

It is in this light that Finland sees the reference to possible regional nuclear non-proliferation agreements in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51. Regional arrangements are complementary to and not a substitute for the existing global régime. We are pleased to note that this point was also stressed by the sponsors of the draft resolution in their introductory statement. With these considerations in mind, Finland will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51.

Mr. RASAPUTRAM (Sri Lanka): Regional disarmament is an important building-block in the field of total disarmament. Given its general nature, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 touches upon the subjects that have been discussed and on which some treaties have already been signed. Tensions have developed in the past and are likely to develop in the future unless steps are taken by all concerned to strengthen the commitments to provide greater confidence for both regional and international security.

Sri Lanka would even have sponsored this draft resolution, had there been reference only to regional matters rather than to subregional matters as well. We feel that reference to subregions might lead to narrow definitions of geographical subregions.

My delegation feels that the draft resolution provides a basis for the continuation of efforts for the achievement of total disarmament, global peace and the security of all nations. We are therefore happy to support it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, entitled "General and complete disarmament", subtitled "Regional disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 13 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 is as follows: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Barbados, Canada, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany, Guinea, Italy, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bhutan, Brazil, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51 was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I wish to explain very briefly Japan's position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, which has just been adopted, as well as on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44, which was adopted yesterday.

Japan supported both draft resolutions. I will not repeat here what I said when we adopted draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.36 and A/C.1/45/L.37 last week. I just wish to stress again the fundamental importance of taking fully into account the specific characteristics of the region when considering regional disarmament issues. In this connection, we highly appreciate the realistic approach referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, on which we have just taken a decision, and in addition refer to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.44, which was adopted yesterday.

There is no doubt that the subject of regional disarmament is one of particular importance and relevance. This is clearly reflected in the number of draft resolutions on this subject that have been introduced in the Committee this year. The delegation of Argentina has supported all of them, for, like draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.51 and A/C.1/45/L.44, they present the matter with the proper balance.

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

Regrettably, however, this is not the case with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.51, on which we have just had to abstain. We would have preferred to see this draft resolution take a broader approach and not a selective one with regard to regional disarmament. In such a subject we cannot pursue only partial goals or ignore other efforts such as unilateral initiatives and bilateral and multilateral negotiations. Neither do we believe that one can be selective as to the weapons covered in regional treaties and ignore the inclusion of certain types of weapons of mass destruction.

We hope that by giving greater thought to the subject and to the text of the draft resolution it will be possible to find a better balance that in future will be satisfactory to all.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The draft resolution (A/C.1/45/L.51) on regional disarmament that has just been adopted contains many ideas which in our opinion are important, such as the link between regional disarmament and global disarmament and the need to bear in mind the guidelines adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to disarmament, as a step towards general and complete disarmament. In the preamble to the draft resolution, reference is made to the desire for peace, the elimination of the danger of war and the release of economic and human resources now used for military purposes and their redirection to and the development of the peoples of the third world in particular. However, in none of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, which formulate specific action, is reference made to the fact that confidence-building a d disarmament measures need to be the result of efforts in the region and should enjoy the support of all.

A matter which, in the view of my delegation, seems important, is that the text does not say that extraregional Powers must contribute to the establishment of clear equality, respect and confidence, which would permit the adoption of disarmament measures. Nor does it say that the nuclear Powers and extraregional Powers must assume responsibility and make a commitment with regard to confidence-building and disarmament measures that may be adopted.

Every region has its own characteristics and peculiarities. Disarmament can only be carried out in a climate of confidence, in a climate of full respect, one in which there are no practices such as the use of force or interference in the internal affairs of States, on military, economic or political acts of aggression. The presence of foreign military bases, especially when they exist against the will of the people and Government, certainly does not contribute to regional disarmament.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

These matters, among others, constitute the basis on which international relations must develop and the same applies to disarmament. These questions are not dealt with concretely in the draft resolution, and for that reason my delegation had to abstain in the voting on it.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): Very briefly, the Hungarian delegation wishes to state for the record that the positive vote which it has just cast was based on the very same considerations as those that were explained in detail by the representative of Finland before the vote was taken.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now move on to cluster 9, to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1. As there has been no request to make a statement or to explain a vote before the voting on this text, we shall proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Science and technology for disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1 are as follows: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Mali, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Venezuela.

I should like also to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Science and technology for disarmament". By the terms of operative paragraph 4 of that draft resolution the General Assembly would recommend that the United Nations

(Mr. Kheradi)

should give appropriate attention to the collection and dissemination of information on scientific and technological developments in the fields of verification and of compliance, by parties, with agreements on arms control and disarmament, application of technologies for improved means of verification and for weapons disposal. In carrying out this task the Secretary-General would take such actions as are practicable within the existing resources of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and therefore there would be no additional programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the United States for an explanation of vote.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States delegation has asked to speak in order to explain its decision to join the broad consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Science and technology for disarmament". My delegation is grateful to the sponsors of this draft resolution for casting it in terms that, in contrast to those of a resolution on the same topic last year, placed the subject in a more realistic and therefore generally more acceptable context.

While the United States delegation was pleased to join in the adoption of this draft resolution, at the same time we wish to outline certain United States understandings which underlie our approach to it. First, the detailed issues related to verification and compliance with any arms control agreement are matters for the parties to such agreements. Consequently, the international activities and co-operation called for in the resolution must be based on voluntary participation or specific arrangements agreed between the interested States.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

The relevance, effectiveness and utilization of any technology for arms control purposes can be determined only by the States directly involved in the specific agreements. This applies equally to conversion.

Secondly, United Nations assistance in the collection and dissemination of information on scientific and technological developments related to arms control and disarmament should be guided by similar considerations; in particular, a vote for such assistance is not an endorsement of a generic role for the United Nations in verification procedures or implementation.

Thirdly, the United States also understands that this draft resolution does not contemplate or endorse any new financial obligations for the United Nations and in that regard notes with pleasure the statement that was just read out by the Secretary of the Committee on behalf of the Secretary-General.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded the consideration of and action on the draft resolutions in clusters 7, 8 and 9 for this morning's meeting. I am well aware of the intensive consultations taking place among the delegations concerned on various draft resolutions. To allow a little more time for consultations, I propose that we keep this afternoon free. In taking stock of the situation so far, I am in a position, first of all, to say that the Committee has accomplished solid work by adopting some 25 draft resolutions.

However, the mathematics of the situation are such that we still have some 29 draft resolutions and a considerable amount of consultations on some of them with three days left for us to conclude our work on the disarmament agenda items. Accordingly, I appeal to all delegations kindly to expedite their efforts with a view to concluding their consultations in a timely fashion. In this way we will ensure that our work will be completed within the allotted time frame.

The next meeting of the First Committee will take place tomorrow morning at 10.30 a.m., when we shall take up draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.40 in cluster 4;

(The Chairman)

L.43 in cluster 5; L.56/Rev.1 in cluster 6; and L.21/Rev.1, L.46 and L.52 in cluster 10. We shall skip those in cluster 11 and move on to draft resolutions L.8, L.17, L.26 and L.32 in cluster 12.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
36th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 14 November 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 36th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. RANA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on all disarmament agenda items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.36
15 November 1990
ENGLISH

90-63220 2844V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.40, listed in cluster 4; A/C.1/45/L.43, listed in cluster 5; and A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, listed in cluster 6. Subsequently, the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1, A/C.1/45/L.46 and A/C.1/45/L.52, which are listed in cluster 10, and then on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.8, A/C.1/45/L.17, A/C.1/45/L.26 and A/C.1/45/L.32, which are listed in cluster 12.

First, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that Cyprus has become a sponsor of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/45/L.21; A/C.1/45/L.31; and A/C.1/45/L.52.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no requests to introduce any of the draft resolutions, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40, listed in cluster 4.

Since no delegation wishes to make a statement other than an explanation of vote or to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40, the Committee will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The draft resolution is sponsored by Sierra Leone on behalf of the members of the African Group of States.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40, entitled "General and complete disarmament: prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". It was introduced by the Representative of Sierra Leone, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States, at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40 was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Papua New Guinea and Sierra Leone advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): For a number of years, the First Committee has been called upon to take action on a draft resolution pertaining to the issue of a "prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

On behalf of the delegation of the Netherlands, I would like once again to state clearly and unequivocally in this forum that indeed we do sympathize strongly with the concerns which led the sponsors of this draft resolution to the initiative they have taken. It is a subject which should interest all delegations since proper care for the environment is increasingly becoming a priority for our Governments. Inasmuch as this subject is being dealt with in the United Nations, it should get due attention in the proper forum, that is, in the Second Committee, not the First.

Last year, quite a few delegations, including my own delegation, worked together constructively in drawing up resolution 44/116 R. In the same spirit, we have attempted, in close co-operation with some other delegations, to introduce a number of improvements in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40.

These efforts were made in a positive spirit in order to bring the draft up to date. We find it odd, for example, that draft resolution A/C/1/45/L.40 refers to a 1989 resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) instead of the more recent IAEA resolution 530 of 21 September 1990, which established by consensus a code of practice on the international transboundary movement of radioactive wastes. IAEA resolution 530 was an African initiative. So why ignore in New York the practical progress made in Vienna?

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

I shall refrain from citing other examples which could have brought the text of draft resolution L.40 more in line with carefully worded language arrived at in the IAEA and in the Conference on Disarmament. We deeply regret that none of the proposed amendments proved acceptable to our African friends, especially since, in most cases, they concerned language which was the result of negotiations on the basis of African initiatives. We can therefore not support draft resolution L.40.

We sincerely hope that in the future a greater sense of accommodation will be shown.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom fully endorses the points made by our colleague from the Netherlands concerning draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40 on the "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

We share the strong sympathy he expressed for the concerns which led the sponsors of the draft to the initiative they have taken as well as the concerns he has voiced.

We have one additional concern about the title of the draft resolution and the agenda item as it appears in operative paragraph 7. For the United Kingdom there can be no question of a prohibition of the disposal of radioactive wastes. Such a prohibition would logically entail a prohibition of all uses of nuclear energy, including peaceful uses.

We understand that this was not the intention of the authors in using the phrase "dumping of radioactive wastes", and we continue to interpret the phrase in the sense of "any use of nuclear waste which would constitute radiological warfare". This is the formulation found in the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The United Kingdom asks our African colleagues to consider this linguistic problem in the future.

Mr. RITTER von WAGNER (Germany): While associating itself with the points made by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, Germany wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40, "Prohibition of dumping of radioactive wastes".

Germany understands the potential problems raised by African countries in the draft resolution. The German Government is fully aware that irresponsible disposal of radioactive wastes can cause serious problems, and it is willing and ready to co-operate in solving such problems should they arise.

Nevertheless, the German delegation had to abstain in the vote. We did so for the same reasons as already pointed by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

Additionally, we would like to draw the Committee's attention to the following points. First, precisely because of the ambiguity of the term "dumping" to which the British representative has alluded, the Conference on Disarmament in its consideration as well as in its report - to which the draft resolution refers - avoids the term "dumping". Therefore, preambular paragraph 7 and operative paragraph 1, which use the term "dumping", are misleading. Secondly, in preambular paragraph 5 and in operative paragraph 2 the draft resolution seems to point to the possibility of nuclear waste being used for radiological warfare. It is my Government's opinion that such a possibility is far-fetched and rather unrealistic. Thirdly, operative paragraph 4 gives rise to the assumption that "deliberate employment of nuclear wastes to cause destruction" in fact has already taken place or is imminent. In such a case, Germany would advocate much more severe action than just adopting a resolution. If, however, proof of such a deliberate employment cannot be established mention of it in this way may lead to misunderstandings which Germany wishes to avoid.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Let me conclude by confirming that Germany will support the supposed aims of draft resolution L.40 in the appropriate forum and in the appropriate context at any time.

Mrs. LETTS (Australia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40, on the "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". We did so because of our overall sympathy for the main thrust of the draft resolution, which draws attention to and expresses legitimate concerns about the potential hazards underlying any use of nuclear waste which would constitute radiological warfare and its implications for regional and international security.

However, we would not wish our positive vote to indicate unqualified agreement to all the terms of L.40. We have some concerns about the appropriate venue and organization for consideration of a legally binding instrument which needs to take into account the various competencies and ongoing work of the Conference on Disarmament, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the International Maritime Organization.

In the case of sea dumping, for example, the appropriate organization is, of course, the International Maritime Organization, which is responsible for the London Dumping Convention and which receives some technical advice from the IAEA.

The question of the prohibition of all radiological waste dumping at sea involving also a comparison between sea and land disposal is, in fact, currently being examined by a subsidiary body established by the London Dumping Convention consultative parties which may lead to a legally binding global prohibition on the sea dumping of all radioactive waste.

As far as land disposal of radioactive wastes is concerned, this is indeed the responsibility of the IAEA. However, we would prefer not to pass judgement one way or the other on the IAEA's work on this matter until we have a better idea of what

(Mrs. Letts, Australia)

is intended. At this stage, we are not in a position to judge which recommendations directed at which organization might be appropriate.

We would also not wish our positive vote for the draft resolution to indicate Australian opposition to land disposal of radioactive waste as such which, at this stage, is the only possible alternative for storing such waste. We affirm, however, our unqualified opposition to the dumping of nuclear waste by any State or organization which would constitute radiological warfare and have great implications for the national security of all States.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation of France abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40, on the "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive waste", for the following reasons.

First, as we have repeatedly stressed, France continues to believe that the question of the dumping of radioactive waste is not in itself within the competence of the First Committee but, rather, that of the Second Committee. Secondly, the draft resolution refers, in its preamble, to resolution 44/116 R, in the vote on which France abstained.

(Mr. Amigues, France)

Thirdly, in the preambular part of the draft resolution there is mention of resolution GC (XXXIII)/RES/509, adopted in 1989 by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, but there is no mention of resolution 530, of 1990, which established a code of conduct on the international transfer of radioactive wastes.

Fourthly, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40 does not reflect the progress made at the Conference on Disarmament in defining the scope of a convention banning radiological weapons. As is stated in the 1990 report of the Conference on Disarmament, such a convention would prohibit the deliberate dissemination of any radioactive matter, including radioactive wastes, with the aim of causing injury, death, damage or destruction through radiation directly or indirectly produced by the disintegration of that matter. It is clear, therefore, that not all dumping of radioactive wastes can a priori be attributed to radiological weapons.

Finally, France believes that it is for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its States members to decide whether the code of conduct in that area already drafted should be replaced by a legally binding instrument.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.40 for the reasons given by the delegations of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Germany, but chiefly because we believe that this matter should be dealt with in the existing competent institutions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43, in cluster 5.

I call on the representative of Canada, who will introduce the draft resolution.

Ms. MASON (Canada): Canada is once again introducing the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", which this year is contained in document A/C.1/45/L.43, dated 31 October 1990. It is sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay and Canada - a group which, once again, is drawn from every continent and every group of countries.

It is our view that this draft resolution makes an important statement. It is a reminder that there are several differing paths that need to be followed in our shared pursuit of a nuclear-weapon-free world. A comprehensive test ban will certainly contribute to the attainment of that end, but even the total cessation of nuclear testing can be no guarantee in itself that the manufacturing and updating of nuclear weapons could not continue. Thus, a ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes constitutes another important element in any progress towards nuclear disarmament. The objective of this draft resolution, therefore, is to complement the nuclear-test-ban approach.

We believe that this is a realistic draft resolution, because it takes the position that progress towards the achievement of a ban on production is related to progress towards the realization of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

In conclusion, I urge all delegations to give their support to this draft resolution, which the sponsors sincerely hope will continue to attract strong and broad support.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): In expressing its positive attitude to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43, "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes", the delegation of Italy wishes to make a specific statement concerning the fourth paragraph, which deals with the progressive conversion and transfer of stocks of fissionable material to peaceful uses.

Italy is convinced that the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes would be a very important step in the process of nuclear disarmament and that the efforts deployed to reach that goal will have to stretch over some time in order to take into consideration all aspects of the problem. In this context Italy believes that due consideration should be given to evaluation of the possibility of converting fissionable material to peaceful uses.

My delegation would like to recall that some studies on this subject promoted by an important group of scientists and experts are under way in Italy. Those studies have already produced some preliminary conclusions, prompting the Government of Italy to circulate them in Geneva at the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as document NPT/Con.IV/29. On that occasion Commission I of the Conference approved by consensus a paragraph of its draft report to the Conference by which an appeal was addressed

> "to nuclear-weapon States to find ways to convert the peaceful uses for the material released from dismantled nuclear warheads as a consequence of nuclear arms negotiations".

As we all know, the Conference, unfortunately, could not agree on a final document.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

We should also like to stress in this forum a further aspect of the proposal which was given favourable consideration in Geneva at the Fourth Review Conference: the hope that if at least some of the resources made available by placing on the market the surplus fissionable materials were set aside that would, above all, satisfy the call for solidarity, the need for which is felt especially keenly in the current economic situation of the world.

As I have mentioned, these studies are still continuing. I should like to inform the Committee that the Italian organization that promoted them has expressed its willingness to share and discuss with interested parties its conclusions on this very complex issue.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43.

I call on the representative of India who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

Mr. CHADHA (India): My delegation is constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43, entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes".

The Final Document adopted by consensus in 1978 at the first special session devoted to disarmament clearly sets out the stages for the process of nuclear disarmament in paragraph 50, subparagraph (b) of which reads:

> "Cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". (resolution S-10/2)

The intent behind the draft resolution is laudable. However, such a partial approach as is represented by the draft resolution in question is not in conformity with the Final Document, which correctly views the issue in its totality. In our view there should be a simultaneous stoppage in the production of nuclear weapons and all fissionable material for weapons purposes. Only by such a total approach can we introduce a universal, equitable and non-discriminatory system of international safeguards on all nuclear facilities.

We believe draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.33 on this subject correctly reflects the goals set out in the Final Document.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43, entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". This draft resolution has been introduced this morning by the representative of Canada.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43 reads as follows: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France

Abstaining: Argentina, China, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43 was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently the representative of Papua New Guinea advised the Secretariat that he had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. DA COSTA e SILVA (Brazil): Brazil voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.43 because we believe that an adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes would be an important measure leading to the cessation of the qualitative and quantitative nuclear-arms race. It is our view that the final objective to be pursued by this and other measures in the area of nuclear disarmament is a universal and non-discriminatory system for the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, and their prohibition and complete elimination.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now move on to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, in cluster 6.

Mr. ADANK (New Zealand): New Zealand is pleased to associate itself with other States in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Following the adoption of two resolutions on the subject at the forty-fourth session, we urged the sponsors of both resolutions to examine closely the merits of drafting a single text for the forty-fifth session. We saw such a move as being consistent with the objective which I think we all share of rationalizing the work of the Committee. We also thought that a single text would give us the opportunity to speak for the first time with one voice on the important subject of negative security assurances.

We are pleased to see that our hope for a single text has now been realized in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, which was introduced yesterday by the representative of Pakistan.

(Mr. Adank, New Zealand)

The main sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.9 and L.19, Bulgaria and Pakistan, should be commended for the spirit of compromise and the flexibility they have demonstrated in undertaking the task of merging the two texts. Clearly, in approaching this exercise a good deal of attention has been paid to accommodating the broad range of views which exist on the topic of negative security assurances in order to ensure the broadest possible support.

A number of elements in the new text should be noted. In particular, we welcome the new reference in the preambular part to the progress now being made in nuclear and conventional disarmament. We also wish to draw attention in particular to the preambular paragraph by which the Assembly would take note of the unilateral negative security assurance declarations already provided by the nuclear-weapon States.

The most important feature of the new merged draft is that it does not prejudge the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament on negative security assurances. For this reason, we think it provides a sound basis for the Conference's continued discussions on this subject, particularly with regard to pursuing the search for a common formula or approach.

One final but important aspect of the new draft resolution is the inclusion of a preambular paragraph which notes the greater willingness which is now evident to overcome difficulties encountered on this subject in past years.

(Mr. Adank, New Zealand)

We think that the constructive discussions on negative security assurances at the recent NPT Review Conference provide a clear indication of the better climate now prevailing for discussions on this issue. As we noted in our general debate statement in the First Committee some weeks ago, it was New Zealand's hope that this better climate would manifest itself in a single text which could command the overwhelming support of delegations within the First Committee at this session of the General Assembly.

We would hope in particular that all States which share concerns over rationalization of the work in the First Committee would demonstrate that commitment by supporting this draft resolution, which represents the clearest manifestation of the willingness of sponsors of important parallel draft resolutions to merge them in a forward-looking approach.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A.C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon-States against the use or threat of use of nuclear-weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the thirty-fifth meeting of the First Committee, on 13 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 has the following sponsors: Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Samoa and Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. DA COSTA e SILVA (Brazil): Brazil voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 in recognition of the efforts of the sponsors to arrive at a common text, merging the text of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.9 and A/C.1/45/L.19. We hope that this positive development will give the necessary impetus to the Conference on Disarmament in carrying out negotiations on the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, pending effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Da Costa e Silva, Brazil)

It is the view of my delegation that the most effective guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Since nuclear weapons are weapons of mass destruction, the non-nuclear-weapon States should be given unconditional and legally binding assurances, on a non-discriminatory basis, against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Brazil also believes that there is a need to establish effective measures of verification on the compliance of nuclear-weapon States with these guarantees in the instruments related to the creation and implementation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, in order to maintain a balance between the nuclear Powers and the non-nuclear-weapon States members of such zones.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): I should like to explain Nigeria's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1 entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

Over the years, Nigeria has been making consistent efforts at various multilateral disarmament forums for the realization of the objectives of the draft resolution. Nigeria has made substantive proposals aimed at finding a realistic solution to the question at the Conference on Disarmament.

Nigeria has always been opposed to pursuing the question in a way likely to undermine existing disarmament instruments, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and imperil the non-proliferation régime Nigeria would like to recall that the concept of negative security assurances was born in the mid-1960s during the negotiations of the NPT, when the non-aligned and non-nuclear-weapon States sought assurances that the renunciation of the nuclear

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

option would not place them at permanent military disadvantage and make them vulnerable to nuclear intimidation in the nuclear era.

Negative security assurances are not an end in themselves but a means to an end. It should therefore not be pursued in total exclusion from its ultimate objective of nuclear disarmament.

It is within the context of the foregoing that Nigeria would like to express reservations on some provisions of the draft resolution. Nigeria would like to reiterate that voting in favour of the draft resolution does not signify consensus on the question of common formula or common approach. Nigeria will not join in consensus for the consideration of this question at any disarmament forum on the basis of common formula.

Nigeria believes that after 12 years of consideration of this question at the Conference on Disarmament, without any positive result, a more realistic approach, one that would take into consideration the reality of the security situation of the present day and the sacrifices made by the non-nuclear-weapon States in the interest of humanity, should be adopted. Unless the sacrifices made by the non-aligned non-nuclear-weapon States are recognized and appreciated, negative security assurances may remain unattainable.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.56/Rev.1.

The United Kingdom wishes to negotiate in good faith at the Conference on Disarmament, but feels that the search for an international agreement on this subject still looks to be very difficult. The text as drafted seems to us, therefore, to go too far towards prescribing a solution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 10: A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1, L.46 and L.52.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation has already stated, during the general debate, that we deplore the fact that the results of the negotiations in Geneva at the last session of the Conference on Disarment were rather disappointing, apart from some progress on technical details. We attribute those disappointing results to several factors: first, the fact that basic problems necessarily arise at the end of negotiations; secondly, a general worsening of the climate of confidence because of the recent threats by one State to use chemical weapons; thirdly, the persistence of proliferation; and, fourthly, the absence of a political momentum similar to that given by the Paris Conference to achieve quickly a convention on the total, final, universal prohibition of chemical weapons and their use.

We hope that the impetus given by the commitment of the United States and the Soviet Union to cease all production and start destroying chemical weapons will be followed by other initiatives, so that negotiations may be resumed in the necessary conditions of trust, transparency and goodwill.

We are convinced that this was also the desire of the sponsors of the three draft resolutions in cluster 10 on chemical and bacteriological weapons, and that their goal is also to improve the chances of achieving a universal convention as soon as possible, while strengthening the commitment to the 1925 Geneva Protocol,

(Mr. Houllez, Belgium)

in order to lessen, by the combined action of the Secretary-General and the Security Council, the risks of the use or threat of use of chemical weapons.

General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus can make an important contribution if they have substance and therefore send a clear, substantive, unambiguous message. The efforts to achieve a combination of those qualities were real and commendable, and we hope that the energy expended with such generosity will be acknowledged by acceptance of the draft resolutions without a vote and also on the resumption of negotiations in Geneva. As I have said, this will depend on the extent to which the draft resolutions help to increase confidence and transparency.

My country, which has declared publicly and solemnly that it wants to be among the original signatories to the future convention, is happy that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1 notes with appreciation the increasing number of States that have declared that same intention, and stresses the particular importance of declarations by States whether they possess chemical weapons. My delegation welcomes the emphasis on the declarations, which will create confidence. At the same time, we regret that it has not been possible to extend consensus to active formulations and that there is not a more resolute looking to the future, with specific commitments that would remove all ambiguity about the real desire of all countries to work positively and specifically to eliminate and ban chemical weapons.

My delegation can understand some of the arguments advanced, but it regards them as an insufficient basis for refusing clarification, particularly with regard to declarations on possession, which are neither speculation about the future nor a legal commitment but a statement of fact accompanied by the political will to put an end to these weapons.

(Mr. Houllez, Belgium)

We know that the road to disarmament is long and demands much patience, but I repeat that in particular it requires mutual confidence. We hope that the will to achieve it will become apparent in the near future. Otherwise, we shall have the unbearable responsibility of again seeing terrible pictures of the victims of chemical weapons.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): On 12 November my delegation introduced draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol". We wish to reaffirm that its central purpose is to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

As my delegation said on 12 November, the most definitive and effective way to ensure that such weapons are not used again is through the conclusion of a global and comprehensive chemical weapons convention. Accordingly, we reaffirm that we attach the utmost importance to the earliest conclusion in the Conference on Disarmament of a global and comprehensive chemical weapons convention.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1 are the following: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet

(Mr. Kheradi)

Socialist Republic, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1 have requested that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there is no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.46, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and preparations for the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 25th meeting of the First Committee, held on 5 November 1990.

Associated with this draft resolution is an oral statement by the Secretariat.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.46 are the following: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Togo, Turkey, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

I shall now read out, on behalf of the Secretariat, the oral statement to which the Chairman referred.

(Mr. Kheradi)

"By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.46, entitled 'Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and preparations for the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention', the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be required for the Third Review Conference and its preparation. It should be noted that the Conference will be a conference of States parties to the Convention. Other conferences of multilateral disarmament treaties - for example, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the sea-bed Treaty and the Amendment Conference of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water - included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the appropriate conference and any sessions of its preparatory committee. Under these arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be required for the Third Review Conference and its preparation would have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the parties to the Convention.

"Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties which under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties at least six weeks in advance."

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.46 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there is no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.46 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, held on 12 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52 are the following: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there is no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolutions in cluster 10 that have just been adopted.

Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation is pleased that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.52 on measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol has once again been adopted without a vote. However, we believe that that draft resolution could have been drafted more scrupulously.

The 1925 Geneva Protocol is the single most important international instrument prohibiting the use of chemical weapons. Therefore, all initiatives aimed at strengthening this instrument should take due account of the positive achievements of international forums. In other words, building on past achievements is the closest way towards our final goals.

The loopholes of draft resolution L.52, which are due to reservations with regard to the Geneva Protocol by some of the draft resolution's sponsors, are as follows. First, in the first preambular paragraph there should have been a specific reference to Security Council resolutions 612 (1988) and 620 (1988). It goes without saying that those are the single most important reactions of the Council to cases of violations of the Geneva Protocol. Secondly, the way the first preambular paragraph has been drafted has overlooked the extensive use of chemical weapons in the recent past. Thirdly, operative paragraph 4 could have sent a strong message if, instead of "noting", the General Assembly had "recognized" the continuing significance of the Security Council decision.

In sum, my country, as the one most victimized by the use of chemical weapons, believes that the decision to submit draft resolution L.52, and, indeed, the General Assembly's continuing approach to measures to uphold the authority of the Geneva Protocol, is a step in the right direction. We wish, however, to note that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus should by no means be construed as approval of its shortcomings by my delegation.

Mr. AWAD (Syrian Arab Republic)(interpretation from Arabic): Once again I should like to explain my delegation's position on the draft resolutions on chemical weapons that the Committee has just adopted by consensus.

The Syrian Arab Republic has a vital national interest in the prohibition of chemical weapons. While supporting the concept of the complete destruction of all chemical-weapon stockpiles, my delegation opposes the concept of security reserves that have been advanced by some major Powers. The Syrian Arab Republic believes that that concept runs counter to the essence of the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and leads to making that draft convention devoid of all meaning.

This is the same position voiced by the Group of 21 at the meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons at its summer session at Geneva. The Syrian Arab Republic calls for a ban on all other weapons of mass destruction in our region, in particular, and throughout the entire world, in general. Syria has reaffirmed that position by accepting the Final Document of the Paris Conference of 1989. We reiterate the need for a linkage between the prohibition of chemical weapons and the prohibition of nuclear weapons in accordance with the priorities set forth in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take decisions on the following draft resolutions, which are listed under cluster 12: draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.8, L.17, L.26 and L.32.

The representative of Italy has asked to make a general statement before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 12, and I now call upon him.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIOSO (Italy): The Italian delegation, on behalf of the European Community and its member States, wishes to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

The Twelve are pleased that the combined efforts of various delegations have made it possible this year to draft one single draft resolution instead of the four traditional texts that were a feature of recent sessions.

It is the view of the Twelve that this reflects the mounting interest in certain aspects of the issue of preventing an arms race in outer space and that it constitutes an encouraging sign for the continuation of the work at the Geneva Conference on this subject, which this year has already given some initial, more positive indications.

The Twelve therefore regard the draft resolution as a promising achievement of this session.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. RITTER von WAGNER (Germany): I am speaking again to explain the position of the delegation of Germany on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32, entitled "Comprehensive programme of disarmament".

Germany will abstain on the draft resolution as a whole since we are of the opinion that the framework for any future work on a comprehensive programme of disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament and the validity of the ideas underlying the programme require thorough discussion within the Conference on Disarmament itself, the outcome of which should in no way be prejudiced by this draft resolution.

We regret that efforts to replace the wording in operative paragraph 1 by the wording in paragraph 1 of last year's resolution were not successful. We are therefore forced to take a decision now on the question of the establishment of an ad hoc committee.

It seems to us far from evident that the re-establishment of an ad hoc group on the comprehensive programme of disarmament would prove to be a promising step. The sponsors of this draft resolution refer to developments in Europe to justify the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee. We think, on the contrary, that the fundamental changes under way in East-West relations, and in the field of disarmament in Europe in particular, are striking evidence of the fact that disarmament is something that cannot be achieved, or even promoted, by elaborating the theoretical disarmament programme with artificial deadlines.

Moreover, we already see difficult tasks ahead of us at next year's session of the Conference on Disarmament. Not only will the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons have to make a major effort to conclude negotiations, but unlike the

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

situation years ago the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive Test Ban, which we hope will be re-established at the beginning of next year's session, will also require our full attention. With such a work-load ahead of us, we do not consider it helpful to fragment delegations' scarce resources further. Germany will therefore vote against operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/45/L.8, entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament". This draft decision was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): This draft decision is sponsored by Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Draft decision A/C.1/45/L.8 was adopted by 130 votes to 1.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the Committee's 26th meeting, on 5 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17 are Bangladesh, Brazil, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Peru, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.17 was adopted by 109 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri#Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17, as a whole, was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

The CHAIRMAN: I have just been informed that, in view of the ongoing consultations and the possibility that there will be a revised, improved text, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26 have requested that consideration of that draft resolution be deferred until the next meeting. With the permission of

---

* Subsequently the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(The Chairman)

the Committee, I agree that we should defer consideration of this draft resolution until the next meeting.

The Committee shall now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", and subtitle "Comprehensive programme of disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 24th meeting of the First Committee, on 2 November 1990.

I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32 are: Bolivia, Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar, Peru and Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32 was adopted by 96 votes to 13, with 20 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32, as a whole, was adopted by 102 votes to 6, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations who wish to explain their vote.

Mrs. MIEDEMA (Netherlands): On behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, I would like, for the record, to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32, entitled "Comprehensive programme of disarmament".

In 1989 we welcomed the conclusion of the Conference on Disarmament concerning the comprehensive programme of disarmament, as stated in its report, that the outstanding issues should be reviewed when circumstances were more conducive to making progress in this regard.

This year's report of the Conference on Disarmament, which reflects a consensus, states on this subject that the organizational framework for dealing with the comprehensive programme of disarmament would be considered at the beginning of its 1991 session.

It is in the Conference on Disarmament therefore that this issue will soon be taken up. This should be the point of departure here in this year's session of the General Assembly. When considering the issue in the Conference on Disarmament, the delegations to the Conference will have to keep in mind the priorities of the various items on the agenda of the Conference.

The delegations on whose behalf I am speaking today do not consider it opportune to reactivate the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament early in 1991. We are engaged in various negotiations on specific disarmament items, both in and outside the Conference on Disarmament. It is this far more direct approach that is yielding substantial results and continuing to do so. The indirect approach of formulating a broad programme has proven to be of lesser expediency.

(Mrs. Miedema, Netherlands)

If necessary, the practice of dealing with the comprehensive programme of disarmament, in formal or informal plenary debate, could be continued.

An attempt now to push the subject back to the level of work in a separate ad hoc committee pre-empts the outcome of planned consultations on the subject in the Conference on Disarmament in 1991, thereby deviating from the recent agreement reached on the issue in that forum. We regret, therefore, that such an attempt is again being made in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.32, about which our delegations have reservations.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak in order to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.8 and L.17.

First, our negative vote on draft resolution L.8, entitled "Naval armaments and disarmament". The requirements for naval armaments and the naval activities of various nations are inherently asymmetrical. They are based on different geographical, political and strategic considerations. For example, separated by the sea from most allies and bounded on both sides by oceans, the United States relies most profoundly on maritime activities and freedom of navigation under international law to protect its security and trade interests. We are not unique in this regard. It is our strongly held view that the relationships among the various naval forces of the world are so different as to preclude a common basis for the negotiations on such forces. Therefore, the United States cannot agree to any limitations or constraints on its naval activities. Further, the United States does not believe that this is an appropriate agenda item and for this reason we voted against the draft resolution.

Secondly, although we abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17, on the "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", we wish to acknowledge that the overall text is a qualitative improvement over its recent predecessors. Careful negotiations have produced a more constructive, objective and positive draft

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

resolution. The United States has not identified issues appropriate for outer-space arms control negotiations in any forum other than those under consideration in the bilateral nuclear and space talks in Geneva. Consequently, we voted against operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. No one should interpret language in other parts of the draft resolution as in any way modifying this firm policy. Of course, when the Ad Hoc Committee on outer space convenes in Geneva, the United States delegation will join its colleagues in the Conference on Disarmament in seeking to enhance undertanding of the many complex issues in disarmament in outer space.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of and action on draft resolutions listed for this morning's meeting.

At our next meeting, to be held tomorrow morning, the Committee will take up the following draft resolutions: in cluster 4, A/C.1/45/L.38; in cluster 5, A/C.1/45/L.5 and L. 35; in cluster 7, A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B; in cluster 9, A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1; in cluster 12, A/C.1/45/L.26; in cluster 13, A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, L.42, L.49 and L.50/Rev.1.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to draw the attention of members of the Committee that, in accordance with its programme of work and timetable, on Monday, 19 November, the Committee is scheduled to begin the general debate and consideration of and action on draft resolutions under agenda item 67, entitled "Question of Antarctica". It would be appreciated, therefore, if delegations wishing to speak on this item kindly inscribed their names on the list of speakers as early as possible.

I should also like to remind representatives that the deadline for submission of draft resolutions under agenda item 67 is also Monday, 19 November, at 12 noon.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.